DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 072 SP 031 341

AUTHOR Robbins, Jerry H.
TITLE Teacher Education in the University System of Georgia.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 16p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Admission Criteria; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Minority Group Teachers; Program Length; Staff Development; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Supply and Demand
IDENTIFIERS *Georgia University System

ABSTRACT

In this assessment of the status of teacher education in Georgia, teacher education is used in the broad sense as any program of studies, or portion of a program of studies, that leads to fulfilling the requirements of the Georgia Board of Education for licensure to practice some aspect of the program in the public schools. The regulations governing teacher certification encompass two-year colleges as well as senior colleges and the two comprehensive state universities. In addition, teacher education programs must meet the requirements of the University System Core Curriculum, System transfer-of-credit policies, criteria of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and institutional policies governing all academic programs. This paper discusses the following selected issues affecting teacher education in the University System: (1) supply and demand of teachers; (2) minority teachers; (3) teacher testing; (4) program admission; (5) program content; (6) length of program; (7) numbers of available programs; (8) finance; (9) staff development; and (10) experimental and pilot projects. Recommendations are made on each of these issues. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310072

TEACHER EDUCATION IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. H. Robbins
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Jerry H. Robbins,
Dean, College of Education
Georgia State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Introduction

"Teacher education" in the University System of Georgia means much more than simply the preparation of persons to become classroom teachers. In this paper, "teacher education" will be used in a very broad sense, as any program of studies, or portion of a program of studies, that leads to fulfilling the requirements of the Georgia State Board of Education for licensure to practice some aspect of the profession (e.g., teaching, administration, counseling) in the public K-12 schools of Georgia.

Every institution in the System has some role in teacher education under this definition. The two-year institutions provide general education, certain course work toward the "major," and, in many instances, introductory work in the pedagogical sequence. The senior colleges provide all that the two-year institutions do and, in addition, each offers work in various "major" fields and various pedagogical sequences. The senior colleges, in many instances, offer "teacher education" at the master's and even educational specialist levels.

The two comprehensive universities, Georgia State University and the University of Georgia, offer the full array of course work, from the baccalaureate through the doctoral level. Even the specialized institutions--Georgia Institute of Technology and the Medical College of Georgia--are involved, in a limited way, in the production of educational personnel for the public school of the state.

The Regulation of Teacher Education

"Teacher education" is one of the most regulated of all fields of study, not only in Georgia, but elsewhere. Some components of the programming are subject to state law. For example, all prospective teachers in Georgia must complete a five-quarter hour course dealing with exceptional children in order to be eligible for a T-4 (T=teaching, 4=based on a bachelor's degree) certificate [i.e., "license"].

Many other components of the programming are regulated by the Georgia Board of Education. This occurs in two forms. One such form is through the "certification" process. Especially when an individual has not completed a prescribed course of study under an "approved program," the individual is subject to a transcript

SP031341

review and must present certain numbers of credit hours in certain patterns of course work. Obviously, if the System institutions are to serve the needs of the clientele, the course work likely to be taken by such individuals must meet the expectations of the certification requirements.

Another component of the regulation of the Georgia Board of Education is the "approved program" process. In order to be eligible to be considered for a "certificate" from the Georgia Department of Education, an individual (other than one submitting his/her credentials for a "course by course" review) must have completed an "approved program." Criteria are established by the Georgia Board of Education on a program-by-program basis. There is a periodic review by a team of persons representing the Georgia Department of Education to insure that an institution's programming sufficiently meets the criteria for "approval" in that teaching field and at that degree level. With only very infrequent exceptions (usually due to the delay between the start of a program of studies and the review for approval), the System senior colleges and universities enjoy complete program approval by the Georgia Department of Education.

All eligible institutions in the University System are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the national accrediting body for "teacher education" programs at all degree levels (baccalaureate and above). NCATE Standards, recently revised, provide additional structure to the "teacher education" programs. NCATE Standards also call for the meeting of the criteria for the preparation of educational personnel of a number of professional organizations.

The University System Academic Committee on Teacher Education from time to time initiates action, which, upon approval of all the appropriate System authorities, becomes a part of the total set of regulations. For example, the System Teacher Education Committee some years ago initiated a set of minimum requirements affecting master's- and specialist- level teacher education programming.

In addition, "teacher education" programs must meet the requirements of the University System Core Curriculum, System transfer of credit policies, Criteria of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, institutional policies governing all academic programs, and so on. In addition, there are a few specialized accrediting associations which regulate portions of the total program of teacher education. For example, the Council on Accreditation of Counseling Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredits school counselor programs at certain degree levels. In addition to all these external agencies, institutional faculty, under institutional governance procedures may (and are, in many cases, expected to) add program detail.

Selected Issues Affecting Teacher Education in the University System

Supply and demand issues. Supply and demand issues typically focus on entry-level positions and on the classroom teaching force. Various studies and projections, especially those of the National Center for Educational Statistics, indicate a considerable shortage of teachers throughout the country by the mid 1990's.

The teacher shortage situation in Georgia is probably even more serious than at the national level. For some years, the public and private institutions in the state have not produced enough teachers to fill the vacancies in the public K-12 schools. It is highly likely that this situation will become worse over the next decade, if current demographic trends continue.

Policies of the Georgia Board of Education permit alternative routes to certification in order to address the necessary numbers of teachers when the Board finds that shortages of numbers of available teachers are such that the supply situation has become "critical." Such fields as secondary mathematics, secondary science, and foreign languages have been found to be in "critical" short supply in the state.

The school districts in Georgia are filling the vacancies in the classrooms by various combinations of (a) recruiting teachers from other states, (b) persuading persons who have previously taught to return to the profession, (c) assisting persons in invoking the alternative preparation program, and (d) other such means outside the employment of persons who have recently completed a teacher preparation program.

System institutions have little control at the present time over the supply situation. Most system institutions could handle larger numbers of persons than have been presenting themselves to the teacher education programs in recent times.

To what extent do the System institutions have a responsibility for recruiting persons into the teaching profession? If there is a responsibility, at what organizational level does it primarily exist? System-wide, with funds to support recruitment for any teaching field at any institution? At the institutional level, with resources made available to recruit persons into any teaching field offered by that institution? At the level of the education unit (college, school, department of education)? At the program level (i.e., prospective teachers of mathematics)? What is or should be the incentive or the reward for an institution or an education program to undertake such a recruitment effort?

Minority teacher issues. The proportion of the school-age population of Georgia that is minority continues to increase. At the same time, the proportion of minority teachers and other school personnel in the work force is decreasing. Few would

argue against having appropriate numbers of minority persons in the public schools to represent our cultural diversity, to provide role models, etc. However, the System institutions are producing relatively few minority teachers.

Some observe that various standardized tests seem to tend to eliminate disproportionate numbers of minority prospective teachers. More important, though, seems to be the fact that minority persons (especially blacks) present themselves for entrance into courses of study leading to becoming a teacher in far fewer numbers than was previously the case.

The issues involved with the lack of numbers of minority teachers are closely related to the teacher supply and demand issue in general. To what extent do the System institutions have a responsibility for recruiting minority persons into the teaching profession? If there is a responsibility, at what organizational level does it primarily exist? System-wide, with funds to support recruitment of minorities for any teaching field at any institution? At the institutional level, with resources made available to recruit minority persons into any teaching field offered by that institution? At the level of the education unit (college, school, department of education)? At the program level (e.g., prospective teachers of mathematics)? What is the incentive or the reward for undertaking such a recruitment effort?

Does the University System, collectively or through its individual institutions, have a responsibility to provide extraordinary services for prospective teachers who are minority? Should there be special financial aids? Should there be special instructional opportunities? Should there be separate or special policies? Are there discriminatory policies or practices that should be changed? Is the responsibility for preparing the bulk of minority teachers in the state that of the TBI's, or, if not, what is the responsibility of traditionally white institutions, especially in areas of the state where relatively few minority persons live?

<u>Assessment issues</u>. Policies of the Georgia Board of Education call for the passing of a paper-and-pencil test, the Teacher Certification Test (TCT) (generally a measure of subject-matter knowledge), before receiving a license to teach. In addition, a performance test, the Teacher Performance Assessment Inventory, is required to be successfully completed in the early years of teaching before a renewable certificate is issued. Some System institutions require or strongly encourage the passing of the TCT as an exit examination before exit from a preparation program. Many System institutions provide instruction on and require successful completion of a "mock" TPAI before program completion.

The Georgia Department of Education gathers and maintains information on the pass rates on these two instruments, by institution. (In the past, the "preparing institution" has been identified by the person taking the test, with no attempt made to veri-

fy the accuracy of the assertion. As a result, some institutions have found that the accuracy of the information has been less than desirable. However, an "auditing" system is currently being put into place.) These data are public information and, on at least one occasion, TCT scores, by institution, were reported in the press.

Further, several years ago, System authorities used pass rates on the unaudited TCT data to place certain programs on "probation." (Assistance was provided to these programs to strengthen them. In some cases, the probation was eventually lifted. In other cases, the program was discontinued. In a few cases, probation continued over several years.)

In the early stages of implementation by the Georgia Department of Education are assessment procedures for experienced teachers and other school personnel. It is likely that, within the fairly near future, the results of these personnel assessments will be available by institution.

Is there a System-wide responsibility for the quality control of persons going into teaching and other educational fields? Or, are quality control issues primarily that of individual institutions? In either case, what is the best way of assuring the public and policy makers that only quality "products" are emerging from the System's teacher education programs?

Should preparation programs and licensure be kept as separate as possible, with the passing of examinations something that occurs after completion of the academic program, as is usually the case with such professions as law and medicine? Or, should exit from a preparation program and eligibility (as measured by one or more instruments) for entrance into practice be the same?

Program admission issues. Through the initiatives of the System Academic Committee on Teacher Education, there are uniform minimum requirements for admission to the undergraduate teacher education sequence. These include a 2.5 grade point average, a "C" average in the freshman English sequence, a "C" in the introduction to education course, passing core curriculum requirements, passing the Regents Test (of reading and composition), and additional requirements set by each institution. These requirements meet or exceed conventional practice throughout the country.

However, little information is available nationally or within the state to indicate the appropriateness of these requirements. Are these the proper ones for predicting success as a teacher? What would be the impact--on the number of teachers and on the quality of teachers--if the requirements were higher or lower? The number of hours, the course work involved, the age of the course work, and the rigor of the course work used to compute the grade point average varies among the System institutions. Should there be greater uniformity on this criterion and, if so, how should it be defined? Are there appropriate alternatives ways by

which an applicant to a teacher education program might demonstrate potential as a teacher? If so, what might they be? Enforcement of the admission criteria is largely left to individual institutions. Should there be a mechanism by which uniform implementation of the criteria is ensured?

It is possible for a person coming through an alternative preparation program for initial certification or for a person preparing as a teacher after having received at least a baccalaureate degree not to meet all these criteria. Should the System take initiatives to insure that all prospective teachers have comparable backgrounds?

Similar issues exist for graduate-level (i.e., master's, specialist) admission criteria.

Program content issues. At the initial preparation level, program content issues fall into three categories. These are: (1) general education/liberal arts background, (2) the content of the "major," and (3) the content of the pedagogical sequence.

1. General education/liberal arts background. Should the prospective teacher have the same amount of general education/liberal arts background as any other baccalaureate graduate? If not, should it be more or less? Should the prospective teacher have the same content in the general education/liberal arts as any other baccalaureate graduate? If not, how should it differ? Should the qualitative aspects of the general education/liberal arts background be different for prospective teachers than for others? If so, in what way? Should there be differences among the grade levels and the subject fields in the general education/liberal arts background or should this generally be the same for all prospective teachers?

2. Content for the "major." For the "academic" secondary teaching fields (e.g., mathematics, English, science, social studies), should the content be quantitatively the same as for a liberal arts graduate in the same field? If not, should it be more or less? For the same group, should the requirements for course work be the same or should they be shaped more toward the advanced study of the content taught in the secondary grades? In the sciences and the social sciences, should the emphasis for prospective teachers be on depth in one field (e.g., chemistry, history) with supporting work in one or more additional fields (e.g., biology, geography) or should the emphasis be on breadth across all the branches of either science or social science?

For the "non-academic" secondary teaching fields (such as business education, home economics), what is the appropriate amount and kind of content for the "major," vis-a-vis the content for the "academic" teaching fields?

For the K-12 teaching fields (foreign language, physical education, music, art), what is the appropriate amount and kind of content for the "major," vis-a-vis the non-teaching major in

the same general field and vis-a-vis the grade-level specialists (i.e., "secondary," "middle grades," "early childhood")?

What is the appropriate major for those headed toward teaching in the middle grades? Should this consist of a strong liberal arts major and a strong minor? Should it ensure breadth across several liberal arts areas and depth in one or two? Should it be pedagogy based because of the special needs of this age group?

What is the appropriate major for those headed toward teaching at the early childhood levels or toward teaching special education? Is is a traditional academic major (i.e., French, history, chemistry, psychology) with additional work in appropriate pedagogy? Is it a carefully structured interdisciplinary major in liberal arts? Is it the traditional major in "special education" or "early childhood education"?

3. Content for the pedagogy sequence. For prospective teachers, how much and what kind of pedagogy is appropriate? Should this be essentially minimum state certification requirements or should institutions add those topics called for by NCATE, the literature in the field, and generally accepted "good practice"? In addition to student teaching, how much and what kind of "field experience" should be included and at what point(s) in the program? Is one quarter of student teaching the appropriate amount?

Where and under what conditions (and supervised by whom) should the field experiences occur? In any classroom where the student teacher or other student is welcome? Only under specially trained K-12 teachers? Under the joint supervision of both college and K-12 personnel? Only in "professional development" schools, where the System institution has a special and broad-ranging working relationship?

Studies are underway comparing the conventional preparation of teachers of mathematics, science, and foreign language with the state's "alternative certification" model. Under the "alternative certification" model, for a person with a liberal arts degree in an appropriate field (and who meets a few other requirements), sufficient pedagogical studies can be completed in a summer (or the equivalent) such that the individual, with "mentoring" and certain other experiences during the academic year (none of which has to be taken for academic credit), can be eligible for full, renewable T-4 certification by the end of the first year of teaching.

If the studies should show that the "alternative certification" model is equally (or more) effective and efficient, what should be the System's position with respect to traditional preparation programs (especially for the secondary academic fields)? If the studies should show that the "alternative certification" model is less effective and efficient, what should be the System's position with respect to participating in aspects of

the "alternative certification" model?

Length of program issues. Two somewhat contradictory trends are being debated among those concerned with policy affecting teacher preparation. One trend, advocated by such groups as The Holmes Group (of which one System institution is a member), is toward five years for initial preparation, usually culminating in a master's degree. Two variations are possible--a "five year" program, in which there is an integrated pattern of studies (general education, content for the major, and pedagogical studies) over the entire five years--and a "fifth year" program, which consists of four years of study toward a traditional liberal arts degree and a fifth year of pedagogical studies.

Another trend, dramatically illustrated by the "caps" on the number of credit hours that can be included in a program in such states as Texas and Virginia, is to insure that all necessary preparation occurs within the space of a conventional four-year baccalaureate degree.

Many System institutions have initial preparation programs that can be completed at or only slightly above 180 quarter hours. However, in varying amounts, some programs in some System institutions require as many as approximately 215 quarter hours to complete.

Increasingly, those formally admitted to a teacher education program already hold at least a bachelor's degree. At one System institution, for example, for the past several years over 50% of those so admitted held at least a bachelor's degree (and often a higher degree) at the time of admission.

Should the System take some position on how long or how short a preparation program should be, or should this remain a matter for institutional determination? If the System should take some position, what should that position be? For the increasing numbers of prospective teachers who hold a baccalaureate (or higher degree) at the time of initiating pedagogical studies, should those studies be at the baccalaureate or the graduate level? Should they be the same (quantitatively and qualitatively) as the requirements for those completing a baccalaureate-level teacher preparation program? If they should be different, in what way should they be different?

Numbers of available programs issues. Especially during a period of rapid growth during the 1960's and 1970's, many teacher education programs at all degree levels were established throughout the state. However, as the number of persons in teacher education programs has diminished considerably and as certification and supply needs have shifted, relatively few programs have been abolished. As a result, there is an apparent proliferation of teacher education programs among the System institutions. Some programs have very low enrollments and few people complete them. Some programs are of questionable quality. Some programs have very limited faculty and other resources to

support them.

At the same time, there is a considerable oversupply of certain kinds of professional personnel. For example, most of the senior institutions in the state prepare persons at one or more graduate levels to be educational administrators. There are now many more persons who have received the training and hold the necessary credential than there will ever be openings. As a result, the System's resources have gone to prepare large numbers of people for a type of position to which they can not reasonable aspire.

Should the System attempt to reduce the numbers of preparation programs and concentrate resources in a fewer number of locales? If so, what criteria should be used to determine those programs that are retained and those programs that are eliminated? Should these criteria be primarily quantitative or should they be primarily qualitative (or some combination of both)? Should the System place a "quota" or a "cap" on the numbers of persons that can participate in a given teacher education program? If so, should these "quotas" or "caps" be related to the resources that are available to support the programs?

Financial issues. For some System institutions, teacher education programs are apparently "money makers" under System and institutional funding arrangements. In such cases, it is not unusual to find relatively low paid faculty, relatively heavy teaching loads, relatively large classes, and the like. Should the System "upgrade" funding formula provisions such as to provide for the financial support of teacher education at levels comparable to that for other professional preparation programs? Should the System monitor institutional spending practices such as to insure that at least the amount of funding allocated for teacher education actually is spent on teacher education programming?

Staff development issues. It is now both possible and common for Georgia teachers to renew certificates indefinitely solely through local district provided "staff development" units, without ever taking any course work toward an advanced degree on for academic credit. As a result, many System institutions have lost large numbers of credit hours, especially at the graduate level. Should the System work to reverse this policy of the State Board of Education? Should the System provide "in load" credit for faculty members who teach non-(academic) credit "staff development" courses? Should the System relax policies against having academic credit- and staff development unit-seeking persons participating simultaneously in the same learning experience?

Responsiveness to changing conditions: experimental and pilot projects issues. Georgia is facing both a considerable shortage of teachers and a considerable shortage of minority teachers, as noted above. Curriculum requirements of the K-12 schools impact on personnel needs. (For example, when a foreign

language became part of the high school graduation requirements, many more foreign language teachers were needed, with no particular provisions made as to where these teachers were to come from.) Several national, regional, and state movements are underway such that preparation programs for school administrators are likely to need to change dramatically. There is likely to be a need in the near future for a relatively large number of elementary school counselors.

The need for additional teachers of English as a second language (ESL) is increasing as the population of the state changes. As Georgia becomes more involved in international trade, there is a need for teachers of languages other than Spanish, French, and German. Much of the population growth in Georgia is occurring in and around the larger population centers with declines in many of the rural areas. As a result, the current teaching force is, to some degree, both maldistributed and not highly mobile. At the same time, there is a great need for certain kinds of teachers (especially secondary mathematics, science, special education, and foreign language) in the rural areas, especially for teachers who are "certified" in more than one teaching field.

More and more children, because of changing social conditions, are being identified as "at risk." As a result, there is or will be demand for more teachers of handicapped children; for school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers; for teachers of ESL; and for many other kinds of specialized personnel to work with this group of children and youth.

Does the System as a whole have a responsibility to address these personnel needs of the state's schools and, if so, how should the System address these needs? Or, is this a matter for each institution to address, based on whatever resources it can bring to the "problem" areas?

If there is one "best" way to prepare and to keep current educational personnel, it is not yet known or generally agreed on. Does the System have a responsibility to support experimental and pilot projects in educational personnel preparation (not unlike efforts that have been made by various parties in the state to investigate and improve agri-business practices, technological advances, and certain kinds of business/industry/trade activities)? If so, in what way and to what degree? (The System has supported in FY89 four sets of activities at four different institutions intended to improve educational practice, especially in the locale of the institutions. Are these the appropriate models for continued and expanded activities in this realm?)

Supply and Demand

1. The System's data gathering and record-keeping system for the "supply" of educational personnel should be expanded to include (a) all persons (not just those obtaining a degree) who complete a program of studies that makes the person eligible for a recommendation for certification* and (b) all types of K-12 educational personnel, not just beginning teachers.

---

*"Certification" is the term used by the Georgia Department of Education to mean the "licensure" of persons to practice some aspect of K-12 education in the public schools of Georgia. Because of its common use in the state, "certification" (and variations of the term) are used here instead of "licensure."

2. The System should work closely with other educational agencies (e.g., the Georgia Department of Education, the Professional Standards Commission, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and the Southern Regional Education Board) to obtain valid short- and long-range "demand" information and to obtain "supply" information from the Georgia independent higher education institutions.

3. Based on the "supply" and "demand" information obtained in recommendations 1 and 2 above and, allowing for such factors as reasonable amounts of in-migration of teachers, the System should establish and maintain annual (for up to, say, ten years in the future) System-wide "targets" for the "production" of various kinds of K-12 educational personnel.

4. Each year, the System should ask of each senior college and university its projections for the "production" of the various kinds of K-12 educational personnel for each year of the rolling ten-year planning period. "Production" generally should be defined as the numbers of persons, by certification field, not necessarily completing a degree, who complete a program of studies leading to a recommendation for certification.

5. For those certification areas where "supply" (System and non-System "production" plus in-migration plus teachers returning to the profession, etc.) is expected to be <u>less</u> than "demand," the System should take steps such as to increase "production" within the System institutions. Such steps might include, either through direct System-level involvement or through incentives to institutions (or both), specific recruitment efforts, provision of financial aid to students entering the targeted programs, the "orchestration" of additional financial aid through other agencies, the establishment of additional programs, the re-training of existing personnel in an oversupply field for the high-demand field, and so on. Sufficient "lead time" should be provided such as to allow for institutions to put into place the necessary

"delivery" mechanisms and for students to have multiple years (in most cases) to move through programs. All steps taken should insure that no diminution of quality of students or quality of programming occurs and that, in all possible cases, quality is increased.

6. For those certification areas where "supply" (System and non-System "production" plus in-migration plus persons returning to the profession, etc.) is expected to be more than "demand," the System should take steps such as to decrease "production" within the System institutions. Such steps might include, either through direct System-level involvement or through incentives to institutions (or both), the scaling down or the phasing out of preparation programs, with a reallocation of resources to high-demand areas. Sufficient "lead time" and transitional resources should be provided such that institutions can accomplish any necessary changes in an orderly fashion.

Minority Personnel

7. Each of recommendations 1-6 above should be treated as a special case with respect to minority personnel. The goal should be to have a percentage of minority educational personnel in the public schools that approximates the percentage of the K-12 student body that is minority.

Assessment

8. In a manner not unlike the joint efforts of the Board of Regents and the Georgia Board of Education to make System freshman admissions requirements and high school graduation requirements highly consistent, the Board of Regents/System staff should take steps such as to reach agreement with the Georgia Board of Education/Department of Education to the effect that exit requirements from a teacher preparation program both are highly consistent with and satisfy eligibility for an unqualified, renewable certification. These provisions should apply not only to beginning teachers but to beginning counselors, administrators, and other types of educational personnel. Further, these provisions should take into account (but be adapted for non-teaching personnel) the recommendation of the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education that

"before [completion of an applicable preparation program]...every candidate should demonstrate his or her knowledge and skills on three measures: (a) a test of knowledge of the subject field to be taught [or the profession role to be practiced]; (b) a test of knowledge and application of the foundations, science, and processes of teaching [or the professional role to be practiced]; and (c) ability to teach [or to practice another professional role] effectively."

Program Admission

9. Program admission requirements for initial preparation programs should be strengthened by (a) insuring that successful applicants have a general education background consistent with the University System's Core Curriculum (even if the general education was obtained at a non-System institution); (b) by defining the categories of course work and number of hours to be computed in the required grade point average; (c) by establishing a monitoring or enforcement mechanism such as to insure that all System institutions are implementing the requirements consistently; and (d) by adopting other admission requirements that at least satisfy the minimum admission requirements established by NCATE.

10. Program admission requirements at the graduate level for teacher education programs should be strengthened (a) by requiring institutions to demonstrate that such requirements are generally comparable to those for other graduate and professional programs at that institution; (b) by establishing a monitoring or enforcement mechanism such as to insure that all System institutions are implementing the requirements consistently; and (c) by conducting periodic studies to ascertain that the admission requirements are both reasonable predictors of success in the program and reasonable predictors of success in practice and, if they are not, modifying the admission requirements.

Program Content

11. The System should insure that institutional policies and practices are such that all persons completing a program of studies leading to a recommendation for certification as a teacher shall have completed a pattern of general education consistent with the University System's Core Curriculum requirements, irrespective of the institution at which the general education was taken.

12. The System should insure that institutional policies and practices are such that the content for the "major" for the secondary "academic" fields for any person recommended for certification is comparable to (both in quantity and in rigor) that for the institution's B.A./B.S. degree in that field, although the "major" may (and probably should) differ to reflect certification requirements, accreditation requirements, and the advanced study of the content to be taught at the secondary level.

13. The System should insure that institutional policies and practices are such that the content for the "major" in the K-12 fields, special education, middle grades education, the vocational fields, early childhood education, etc., for any person recommended for certification, is comparable to (both in quantity and in rigor) that for the secondary academic fields, although it may (and probably should) differ considerably from a conventional liberal arts single-subject field major such as to reflect the professional role for which the person is preparing.

14. The System should insure that institutional policies and practices are such that any person recommended for certification has completed a program of pedagogical studies that is consistent with NCATE Standards for such.

Length of Program

15. The System should conduct studies (or, preferably, provide support and/or incentives for institutions to conduct studies) of various models of program length and structure for the initial preparation for teaching. Should carefully conducted, longitudinal studies, supported by data from elsewhere, show that some one pattern of program length or structure is superior to others, then steps should be taken to implement that model throughout the System.

Numbers of Available Programs

See Recommendations 5, 6, and 7 above.

Financial Issues

16. The System should make modifications in the funding formula such that institutions are given the same amount per credit hour for education courses as for other clinical and laboratory courses and the same amount for students in education as for students in other professional schools. Further, the System should take steps to insure that internal allocations within institutions to the education units reflect the allocations to the institution for programming in education.

Staff Development

17. The System should provide policy changes and incentives to institutions such as to permit and encourage faculty members, for "in load" credit, to provide mutually agreed upon services to local school districts, especially in the area of staff development for faculty and professional staff.

Responsiveness to changing conditions: experimental and pilot programs

18. The System should provide initiatives and/or support institutions to take initiatives to address both changing conditions (many, but not all, of which are addressed in the recommendations above) and selected institutional efforts to establish experimental and pilot activities related to school improvement. In terms of process, there should be considerably expanded formal communication between System authorities and representatives of

the Georgia Department of Education, public school districts, and other state agencies and organizations.

Among the initiatives that show promise that should be addressed by the System and/or one or more of its institutions, in collaboration with other educational agencies, are:

A. Support for vastly different leadership preparation programs that are in line with recent national administrator organization recommendations for such.

B. Creation and support of public school sites that serve as "demonstration" schools or as "professional development" schools--locations where one or more System institutions and a school district have a special working relationship for clinical experiences for prospective educational personnel, for applied research, for modeling and demonstrating "best practices," etc.

C. Establishment of policies and practices that (i) place professionals-to-be only with specially trained and qualified school-based clinical supervisors and (ii) appropriately reward the school-based clinical supervisors for their service to the preparation program.

D. Creation of a "center," serving all the preparation programs in the state, for excellence in teacher preparation.